



U.S. Department of Energy  
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy



# *Application Content and Merit Review Process*

## **D1 Breakout Session Report-Out**

**Solar America Initiative  
Technical Exchange Meeting  
April 17, 2006**



**Will the application content requirements allow your technology to be well represented? Is the application content clearly defined? What is the appropriate level of detail for the technical project plan? Week by week? Monthly? Subcomponent? Component? System?**

- Format proposal requirements and limit pages to no more than 50 pages.
- Scope/Objectives should be clearly defined in the FOA
- LCOE/SAM model does not capture advantages of storage
- The FOA should require a higher level of detail for Phase 1 and the first year



## **Is the requested level of detail for manufacturing cost breakdown a feasible level of detail to provide? Are there any issues associated with the level of detail needed for SAM input requirements?**

- SAM model is too restrictive
- Degradation information may not be available for new technologies to be entered into the model.
- Cost vs. Price in SAM model
  - Need more clarity
  - Discomfort with divulging all manufacturing cost details
- Possibly provide template clarifying required level of detail for Bill of Materials
- Clarify where recycling and recovery costs would be captured in the SAM model



## **Are the Merit Review Criteria appropriate for allowing reviewers to adequately assess a proposed effort? Are the categories sufficient and appropriate? Are the weighting proportions appropriate?**

- There was a disagreement on whether ES&H be a separate Merit Review Criterion
- Clarify some of the overlap requirements under the Statement of Objectives and the Business Plan technical requirement sections.
- “Best Value” determination be added as a Merit Review criterion
  - Clarified in the session that this is normally a Program Policy Factor
- Criteria do not capture the SAI Objective of job creation



**Would you be capable of and/or willing to submit a full Partnership business plan with all the details cited? Will such a plan add value to R&D planning and management?**

- Clarity desired on level of detail required. Full plan or summary?
- Criteria may not be suitable for subcomponents R&D as compared to systems



## **Based on what you have heard up to this point, what concerns/recommendations do you have concerning the time necessary to prepare the applications?**

- The amount of work to prepare a full FOA application would be huge
- Pre-applications are recommended
  - 3-12 weeks to respond to pre-application
  - Disagreement on range of pages; i.e. 2-5, 10-20
  - Should be short in length and time frame to minimize effort and cost
- Pre-application to provide feedback to make applications more competitive
- Disagreement on whether pre-applications should be mandatory and be used to define the competitive range
- Pre-app should be tied to the Federal Budget appropriation
- A pre-application process may interject a bias toward larger, more established, better known companies



**Typically, FOA Applications limit the Narrative Description to address the Technical Requirements to no more than 25-30 pages. For this proposed FOA, can an Applicant adequately cover the requested information within these page limitations? (Does not include resumes, certain other supporting documentation)**

- Agreement that the 25-30 pages was an appropriate limit
- FOA requirements should allow for BIPV